

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 23 are pending in this application of which claims 1, 21 and 22 are the independent claims. Independent claims 1, 21 and 22 and dependent claims 10, 16, 19 and 20 are amended. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Peters et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,884,284 hereinafter "Peters").

Claim 1 is directed to a method of managing workflows in a service provider environment in which a service provider provides data storage resources to a customer. The method includes providing the customer with a list of types of work order requests to select work to be performed based on a permission level defining a level of access to the data storage resources allowed to the customer. The work order requests include requests to manage configuration of the data storage resources provided to the customer. The method also includes receiving a selection of a type of work order request from the customer prior to performance of work associated with the selection, enabling the customer to generate a work order request of the selected type in a work order request submission, creating a database object based on the work order request and storing the database object in a database. The list of the types of work order requests includes at least one of requests to create a mirror or to restore remote mirroring.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art does not contain all the claim elements recited in claim 1. For example, Peters does not disclose or suggest that a list of the types of work order requests includes at least one of requests to create a mirror or to restore remote mirroring (see, for example, page 11, lines 18 to 26 of Applicants' specification).

Peters discloses a system that “creates, maintains, processes and analyzes individual users for telecommunication services” (see Abstract of Peters). Peters does not disclose or suggest mirroring much less types of work requests that include creating a mirror or restoring a remote mirror. Therefore, Peters does not disclose or suggest that the list of the types of work order requests includes at least one of requests to create a mirror or to restore remote mirroring.

Claim 21 is an apparatus claim having corresponding features to claim 1. Applicants submit that the Peters reference should also be withdrawn with respect to claim 21 for at least same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 22 is an apparatus claim with all the elements being means-for claim elements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, paragraph 6 having corresponding features to claim 1. Applicants submit that the Peters reference should also be withdrawn with respect to claim 22 for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 23 is further distinguished from the art in that Peters does not teach work order requests to split a business continuance volume (BCV).

Applicants submit that all dependent claims now depend on allowable independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the art rejection.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for withdrawing the prior art cited with regard to any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as

specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

All correspondence should be directed to the address below. Applicants' attorney can be reached by telephone at (781) 401-9988 ext. 123.

Applicants submit electronic payment concurrent with this submission to pay for excess claim fees. No other fee is believed to be due for this Response; however, if any other fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0845 referencing Attorney Docket: EMC-034PUS.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

29 October 2007



Anthony T. Moosey
Reg. No. 55,773
Daly, Crowley, Mofford & Durkee, LLP
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A
Canton, MA 02021-2714
Telephone: (781) 401-9988 ext. 123
Facsimile: (781) 401-9966
atm@dc-m.com